

REMARKS:

The Interview Summary form mailed on January 18, 2004 states that any formal written reply that is filed to an outstanding action must include the substance of the interview. A response to the Final Office Action was filed prior to receipt of the Interview Summary. To fully comply with the requirement set forth in the Interview Summary, Applicants' representative provides the following summary of the substance of the interview.

During the telephonic interview on January 5, 2005, Applicants' representatives point out that proposed claim 5 distinguished over the art of record since the art did not disclose nor suggest alternating layers of abrasive and adhesive material. Proposed claim 8 distinguished over the prior art since the art did not disclose nor suggest a pad with a plurality of composite layers, each including adhesive and a plurality of abrasive particles. Proposed claim 15 distinguished over the prior art since the art did not disclose nor suggest a method for cleaning and shaping a probe tip that includes a multilayered pad, with multiple abrasive layers separated by adhesive material.

The Examiner agreed that the proposed claims were patentable over the art and that the presentation of those claims in a response would result in allowance of the case.

It is respectfully submitted that the above is a summary of the substance of the interview. If the Examiner believes that direct communication with Applicant's representative will facilitate allowance of this application, or if there are any questions regarding this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Gerald W. Back et al

By: 

Robert E. Cannuscio
Registration No. 36,469
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
One Logan Square
18th & Cherry Streets
Philadelphia, PA 19103-6996
Tel: (215) 988-3303
Fax: (215) 988-2757
Attorney for Applicants